

Oak Street
UNCLASSIFIED

END-OF-YEAR REPORT
on the
GIFTED EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT
Robert E. Stake, Director

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

August 15, 1971

Summerville

87c5

END-OF-YEAR REPORT

Table of Contents

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Finances, Personnel, Projects, Deliverables, including Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3	1
The Accountability Notebook	7
Dissemination of Evaluation Materials	9
Liaison Activities	13
Jacksonville	17
CIRCE Resource Center	18
Curriculum Analysis Training	19
Correspondence Course	20
Evaluation Design of a Special Program for Talented Youth	21
The Comparison of Evaluation Models	23
Achievement Testing	24
Curriculum Evaluation	25
Measuring Priorities, including Figure 1	26
Report of the Evaluation Committee	(Yellow Section)
 <u>Appendices</u>	
Appendix 1: The Accountability Notebook	
Appendix 2: "Guide for Rating an Evaluation Plan"	
Appendix 3: Three Case Studies	
Appendix 4: Jacksonville Questionnaires	
Appendix 5: CIRCE Resource Center Topical File	
Appendix 6: Curriculum Analysis Training Videotape Manual	
Appendix 7: "Measuring What Students Learn" - Robert E. Stake	
Appendix 8: "National Assessment" - Robert E. Stake	

of the

GIFTED EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

August 15, 1971

As a second year continuation of a 1969-1970 Illinois Gifted Program Experimental Project in July 1970 the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRE) was funded by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, through the Department of Program Development for Gifted Children, and the University of Illinois to develop evaluation materials and procedures for local "Reinforcement Projects". The amount of the new funding was \$8,000 including indirect costs.

The objectives of the experimental project were stated in our proposal for both years' work in the following words:

- a. To develop practical evaluation procedures and instruments relating materials for use in reinforcement and other projects for the gifted in the state of Illinois. Such procedures include overall evaluation plans as well as the instruments for gathering data--e.g., check lists, observation schedules, tests.
- b. To organize and translate these procedures so they are more easily disseminated and adapted for use in the individual classroom.
- c. To maintain a background for doing enlightened development work, a research background, a climate within which leading educators and evaluation specialists will be challenged to tackle practical evaluation questions raised in the classroom.
- d. To synthesize and make use of the models and findings available from research and development activities throughout the world as they relate to problems of evaluating educational programs for the gifted.

The staff and principal contributors to this project are shown in Table 1. Numerous members of the College of Education faculty and the student body made unreimbursed contributions to this project. Its progress was particularly stimulated by the presence in the same offices of the statewide Evaluation of the Illinois Gifted Program directed by Ernest House. CIRCE staff members J. Thomas Hastings and James Wardrop were frequent contributors. The personal assistance of Robert Hardy and his OSPI state staff was also instrumental in the progress of the CIRCE Gifted Experimental Project.

The proposal for second-year funding identified four operating objectives or emphases to give substance to the project's global objectives. The work done on each emphasis is briefly mentioned in Table 2 and described in detail in Table 3.

The allocation of funds and staff time to project activities are estimated in Table 3. The funding for many of these activities came jointly from the Experimental Project and other CIRCE contracts.

Products of these activities are included in the appendix as follows:

- A. The Accountability Notebook*
- B. Guide for Rating an Evaluation Plan
- C. Three Case Studies*
- D. Student Questionnaires
- E. "Measuring What Students Learn"*
- F. "National Assessment"*
- G. CIRCE Resource Center
- H. Curriculum Analysis Training--manual

The project was evaluated internally and externally. A team consisting of Glenn Bracht (chairman), Duane Neet, and Joe Walker visited the project for one day and prepared the report included here just ahead of the appendix.

*These appendices will be blank except in official copies of this final report; the Accountability Notebook will be omitted in all copies.

Table 1

Activities and Responsibilities of Persons Working One-Fourth Time
or More on the CIRCE OSPI Gifted Experimental Project
1970-71

Staff Member	Percent of year worked	Activities and responsibilities
Robert E. Stake	(.25)	Project director Accountability Notebook development Measuring student learnings (performance contracting) CMAS video-tape
Terry Denny	(.66)	Accountability Notebook development, follow-up Site visits, liaison Training with state staff
Robert Wolf	(.50)	Classroom report, follow-up Accountability Notebook development, follow-up Teachers' feelings toward evaluation, study
Terry Hopkins Elofson	(.50)	CMAS video-tape, development Project administration Correspondence course, development
Craig Gjerde	(.33)	Evaluation of high school gifted program Site visit for training
Christine George	(.25)	Resource center Accountability Notebook, resources Site visit for training
Clencie Cotton	(.25)	Consultation for gifted projects and community relations Shadow study, junior high school
Edward Kelly	(.25)	Evaluation design, theory
Mary Sue German	(.25)	Resource center

Table 1 (continued)

Staff Member	Percent of year worked	Activities and responsibilities
Dennis Gooler	(.25)	Accountability Notebook development Measuring educational priorities
Gordon Hoke	(.25)	Effingham study Accountability Notebook development
Consultants:		Other Contributors (Total = .75 FTE)
Les McLean		Gini Gonsalves
Don Cunningham		Doug Curry
Richard Mann		Ethel Mincie
Gene Jabker		Marjorie Lee
Maurice Eash		Val Summerville
Jim Sanders		Michael Plog
Gene Glass		Mary Anne Bunda
Ken Komoski		
Marjorie Edelson		
Gary Storn		
Barak Rosenshine		

Table I (continued)

Staff Member	Percent of year worked	Activities and responsibilities
Dennis Gooler	(.25)	Accountability Notebook development Measuring educational priorities
Gordon Hoke	(.25)	Ellingham study Accountability Notebook development

Other Contributors (Total = .75 FTE)

Glenn Gonsalves
Doug Curry
Echel Hinkle

Consultants:

Les Nelson
Don Cunningham
Richard Mann
Gene Jasker
Maurice Bash
Jim Sanders
Gene Glass
Ken Kestel
Marjorie
Gary Stern
Barak Rosenblum

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Table 2

Proposed and Actual Activities

<u>Proposed Emphases</u>	<u>Actual Activities</u>
<u>In-service training</u> Training materials and activities will be developed to aid gifted project personnel in the evaluation of their programs. Regional workshops, in-school meetings, and individual study will be considered as alternate approaches.	<u>Training and Liaison</u> 1. Springfield workshop 2. Champaign Ramada 3. Jacksonville 4. Classroom Report Follow-up 5. Correspondence Course Try-out
<u>Liaison</u> CIRCE will increase its efforts to work together with OSPI officers and gifted project staff members across the state in matters of planning, demonstrating, and public relations as well as evaluation.	<u>Development</u> 1. Development of Account-ability Notebook 2. Distribution and Follow-up of Accountability Notebook 3. Development of CMAS Films 4. Evaluation Plan for Institute
<u>Achievement Testing</u> Within CIRCE a complete reorganization of the Illinois Statewide Testing Program is scheduled. It will be an objective of the Experimental Project to guide the efforts of these testing activities so that they are meaningful to the teacher--especially the gifted project teacher--who wants to monitor student progress in specific areas.	<u>Basic Research</u> 1. Analysis of hazards in testing for performance 2. Analysis of <u>National Assessment</u>
<u>Measuring Priorities</u> The project staff will continue to study ways of measuring and reporting the priorities of a classroom teacher, a gifted project, or an entire school district.	1. Study of the differences between stated and operationalized priorities

Table 3

A Summary of the Allocation of Work and Funds
for Each of the Main Objectives
of the CIRCE Gifted Experimental Project, 1970-71

<u>Objective</u>			<u>Results</u>
DEVELOPMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY NOTEBOOK			Analyses of techniques
Intended	0 FTE	0	Self-evaluation plan
Actual	1.00 FTE	16 K	DESDEG tryouts
			Lakeview plan
DEVELOPMENT OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING MATERIALS			
Intended	1.25 FTE	17 K	
Actual	.75 FTE	17 K	
COMPARISON OF EVALUATION MODELS			Test and evaluation guide
Intended	.75 FTE	14 K	OSOT observations
Actual	0 FTE	0	
RESEARCH ON ACHIEVEMENT TESTING			Experimental findings
Intended	.50 FTE	12 K	Instrument survey
Actual	.25 FTE	2 K	Working Paper #5
			Working Paper #6
DISSEMINATION AND FOLLOW-UP STUDIES			Forms
Intended	.25 FTE	2 K	Field test results
Actual	.50 FTE	5 K	Manual
			Teacher materials
STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES			Working Paper #1
Intended	.50 FTE	8 K	Review of literature
Actual	.50 FTE	8 K	AERA paper (#7)
			Items for survey
MAINTAIN REFERENCE LIBRARY			Library collection
Intended	.50 FTE	4 K	Files
Actual	.50 FTE	4 K	Newsletter
LIAISON WITH SCHOOLS AND STATE OFFICE (including in-service training)			Identification of needs
Intended	.50 FTE	5 K	Staff-briefing notes
Actual	.75 FTE	10 K	Working Paper #4
			Categorical aid paper
ADMINISTRATION			Coordination
Intended	.25 FTE	10 K	Evaluation
Actual	.25 FTE	10 K	Final Report

NOTES: FTE = Full-time equivalent for academic year; faculty and graduate students not distinguished.. Total FTE = 4.50.

All figures are estimates. K = intended allocations for academic year 1970-71 in thousands of dollars. Total K = \$72,000.

The Accountability Notebook

The Accountability Notebook began with a dissatisfaction on the part of Robert E. Stake for the narrowness, rigidity, and negativism seen in the dominant view of education accountability. To counteract this unacceptable point of view, he designed a plan to produce an educational product which would enable school men to broaden, enliven, and make more positive their views of education accountability.

To broaden their view, it was decided that the Accountability Notebook should be multidimensional, moving beyond the fiscal and legal responsibilities which school men recognize as central concepts in their view of education accountability.

He sought to enliven the view of education accountability by making the product in a loose leaf notebook form, thereby somewhat encouraging the school man to grow in his view and to add or delete from the Notebook as he sees fit.

The Accountability Notebook was to be a positive statement of the opportunities that were already at hand for the school man to demonstrate the ways in which he was being accountable to his public, to suggest standards and procedures for achieving a more accountable posture where necessary, and to encourage him to include local entries in his Accountability Notebook where they were already at hand.

The plan called for four major sections (with three subdivisions in each) roughly entitled School Audit, Student Performance, Teacher Performance, and Administrative Performance. A preliminary conference to discuss the contents of the opening statement, the standards, the procedures, and the items to be included under each of these sections, was planned for early December. At that conference, elementary school, high school, and university people met to discuss the Accountability Notebook. Present were subject specialists, curriculum specialists, and learning, evaluation, and measurement specialists. Preliminary statements were drafted at that conference for three of the twelve sections, and the decision was made to secure the other nine statements from experts in those respective fields. From that point in December through to the first week in March when the first prototype of the Accountability Notebook was ready, the usual hundreds of man-hours were spent in securing the help of experts, writing the draft statements, seeking criticism from expert reviewers, rewriting, and in some instances rewriting as many as five times.

During the month of March the Accountability Notebook draft was taken into three school districts for field testing: Urbana, Effingham, and Highland Park. The counsel we received from superintendents, business managers, teachers and others in the field was heeded in the final revision of the Accountability Notebook prior to its going to press. Some of the critical reviews which we obtained from informants in these three test sites were included in the opening statements of the Notebook itself.

One thousand copies of the Accountability Notebook were printed and were ready for distribution by the first week in April. One hundred fifty

copies of the Accountability Notebook were delivered the day they came off the press to State Department Gifted Project supervisors. The following week all remaining gifted projects received an Accountability Notebook through the mail. In addition one hundred twelve copies were sent to the State Department for use with various service centers; they also received an additional hundred copies for their own use. During the past three months copies have been sent out for research and evaluation purposes to individuals, school districts, colleges, and corporations throughout the United States. At the time of this report CIRCE has on hand fewer than one hundred copies of the Accountability Notebook.

In May of 1971 all Accountability Notebook owners received a packet of additional entries for updating their notebooks. These included a number of annotated references, information concerning performance contracting, and several checklists and summary charts (see appendix). Recipients were left to place the sheets in the Accountability Notebook sections where they most fitted their schools' particular needs and uses.

And what of that final form? The organization of the Notebook is as follows: The four divisions (administration, teaching, students, school) have three sections each; each of the twelve sections has five subsections: a. A summary overview of the responsibility of the school man in a particular area; b. A statement of the standards that are available for assessing accountability; c. A statement of the procedures which CIRCE recommends for use; d. Suggested entries to be made by the local school man in the notebook; e. A brief basic reference list, annotated for the user. The introduction to the Accountability Notebook discusses four basic dimensions to accountability as viewed by CIRCE: personal responsibility, attribution of programs for components to its products, evaluation, and public disclosure. In reality, disclosure is probably a dimension included within each of the first three.

CIRCE contends in the Accountability Notebook that once personal responsibility for program development or for a given task within the school system has been identified, then the accountable school man discloses the statement of responsibilities to interested parties. Attempts to find cause and effect relationships associated with the implementation of certain programs are disclosed as well, and the school man also discloses the results of evaluation studies he conducts to determine the merit and worth of his educational program.

A full report of Accountability Notebook dissemination and follow-up procedures can be found elsewhere in this report (see Dissemination of Evaluation Materials section).

Dissemination of Evaluation Materials

As it evolved, one of CIRCE's responsibilities for this past year has been the dissemination of evaluation materials to be used by Gifted Program personnel. Two instruments which were given attention this year are the Classroom Report, which had been developed by CIRCE for the Gifted Program last year, and the Class Activities Questionnaire, which was designed by Joe Steele three years ago. A third product, the Accountability Notebook, developed by CIRCE this year, was the subject of an extensive dissemination effort this spring.

CLASSROOM REPORT

Early last fall CIRCE conducted a telephone survey to a sample of the OSPI staff who had requested Classroom Report forms in late spring of 1970. We were distressed to discover that only a very few teachers were using the Classroom Report. Upon more extensive inquiry as to why the Classroom Report was not being utilized (questioning of many teachers and other staff personnel) we discovered that:

1. Dissemination strategy utilized by state staff was poor. Many of the Reimbursement Directors simply had Classroom Reports (CR) dropped on their desks and were told to use them if they wished.
2. The teachers who had seen it were not sure that it was appropriate to modify the CR. Therefore, if there was a section which disturbed them, they tended not to complete the instrument at all.
3. Many teachers were threatened by the fact that the CR was promoted as a reporting device. They were and still are not ready to commit themselves to the task of reporting on their classroom activities.
4. One of the more often expressed comments was that completing the CR was simply too time-consuming for the teacher, and that time could not be given to a new and unfamiliar instrument.
5. On a positive note, ~~several teachers~~ commented that completing the CR enabled them to logically think through and assess their classroom program. This self-assessment aspect of the Classroom Report had a certain appeal to them.

Based on these facts, it became clear to us that if we wanted the CR to be used we needed to assume responsibility for promoting it (the original dissemination responsibility had been left to the state staff). A part of last year was spent in doing precisely that. The CIRCE staff used some of the year's workshops and training sessions to describe to state staff the use and function of the Classroom Report (see Liaison Activities section in this report).

Despite these presentations and personal consultations the Classroom Report was still not used extensively this year. Our experience demonstrated quite well that attempting to introduce teachers to new formal evaluation procedures is no easy task. To address this problem, Robert Wolf has looked closely into that matter by engaging in a study of the role of the teacher in classroom evaluation. The purpose of this study is to discover how teachers feel about the role of evaluation as well as about the general notion of evaluation. Designed around the CR's low incidence of use, the study gathered judgments from teachers as to the practicality and worth of the CR and other more general evaluation issues. (This study will be made available to the OSPI state staff upon completion.)

CLASS ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

The Class Activities Questionnaire (CAQ) was developed for use in evaluating the Illinois Gifted Program. Initial development and field testing occurred between October 1968 and March 1969, and data was collected in spring 1969. A computer program developed at Northwestern was revised and adapted to the IBM 360 computer at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in the fall of 1969.

In 1970 the instrument was requested for use in several hundred classrooms in Illinois. It was supplied and processed by the evaluation project until November 1970. At that time the demands of the evaluation project precluded further servicing of CAQ requests.

In 1970 and 1971 a number of researchers requested permission to utilize the Class Activities Questionnaire in their studies. Two researches were reported in papers at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the AERA. Studies are in progress in Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Newfoundland.

Beginning in November 1970, discussions were initiated at four universities in Illinois to arrange for agencies to supply and service CAQs on request. In June 1971 arrangements were finalized to establish two centers in Illinois to service the instrument. Dr. Robert Rosemier, Graham Hall, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, will direct the supply and processing of CAQs for the northern half of the state in cooperation with the Rockford Area Service and Demonstration Center, which will provide consultants and follow-up services. Mr. Richard Bodine, director of the Champaign Area Service and Demonstration Center will supervise the servicing of CAQs for the southern half of Illinois.

Both centers will supply these services to the districts at cost. By contractual agreement with the Gifted Program Development Section of the OSPI, the state will provide funds to cover indirect costs until volume makes the operations self-supporting. The current estimate of the charge to schools for use of the instrument is \$7.00 per classroom group of up to 30 students. Further information will be available from these centers in the near future.

Both centers have operational computer programs and are expected to be functioning in September 1971. The center at Northern Illinois University will supply all requests from out of state in addition to requests from Illinois teachers and researchers.

The CAQ has been presented to groups of teachers on a number of occasions. (CEC 1970, AERA Annual Session 1971, California Association for the Gifted 1971, several teacher workshops around the country.) In the last year, training sessions in the use of the CAQ have been conducted with the regional consultants of the Illinois Gifted Program and with directors of all Area Service and Demonstration Centers in Illinois. None of these presentations produced many requests for use of the instrument.

Why this apathy towards what appear to the evaluation staff to be a useful instrument for teachers? First, we hypothesize, there has been some doubt as to availability of services to score the instrument. It is difficult to score by hand. The mailing in of forms no doubt discourages use. A second probable deterrent is that no information is at hand as to how a teacher might use the information to change his behavior or develop activities more in line with his ideal. Similarly, the CAQ does not simplify any existing tasks of the teacher. It does not help evaluate individual students or eliminate other tasks the teacher must accomplish. If anything, it creates a threat to the teacher's self-esteem and requires considerable review and self-assessment, if the results are to be useful.

A third element in its lack of use is that administrators are discouraged from using it to evaluate teachers. As its use directly benefits only the teacher himself and it does require both time and money, teachers may feel that their administrators would not support their use of it. Finally, internal difficulties and changes in the funding and organization of the Illinois Gifted Program also drew attention away from the utilization of this instrument.

Where the instrument has been used, a state consultant or evaluation staff member has strongly promoted and encouraged its use. Such active promotion and advocacy seems to be required to get teachers to use it. Perhaps, a program of training should be developed to accompany its use in many situations. This training might well be built around the self-assessment approach and include the CAQ as one of a number of instruments to aid the teacher. It seems unlikely that the CAQ will enjoy much use without such supporting services and active promotion.

ACCOUNTABILITY NOTEBOOK

In dealing with Accountability Notebook dissemination, it was decided on the basis of past experiences that CIRCE would take a great deal of initiative in disseminating the Notebook. Dissemination strategy was developed with the intention of conducting a major follow-up project next year. CIRCE has used several means to disseminate the Notebook; next year its general usage will be monitored in part to learn whether certain modes of dissemination were more effective than others. The dissemination methods selected were as follows:

1. Received by Direct Mail - Approximately one hundred ninety Notebooks were mailed to Reimbursement Directors, Service and Demonstration Center Directors, and Area Service Center Directors throughout the state. These Notebooks arrived with a cover letter from the Director of the Program which made a reference to the Notebook but did not describe the possibilities of use. Staff personnel were left on their own initiative to decide ways the Notebook could be used to help them.

2. Received Personally from State Staff Supervisor - Approximately one hundred sixty-five Reimbursement Directors in the Chicago area, and fifty-five Directors in the central part of the state, received their Accountability Notebooks directly from state staff personnel. It was hoped that this mode would engender a discussion between Directors and state staff as to potential, applicability, and the like, and that this discussion would encourage the Director to use and modify the Notebook to a greater extent.

3. Received at Workshops on Accountability - Approximately eighty participants received their Notebooks when they attended one of the four Accountability Notebook Workshops held around the state this May. Attendance was not mandatory, but pressure has a way of being exerted, and voluntarily or not many Service and Demonstration Directors were there because they felt they had to be. The method of presentation of the Accountability Notebook differed somewhat at each workshop but the content was quite similar. The four basic themes of accountability (disclosure, responsibility, evaluation, and attribution) were discussed at length and asserted to fuse all dimensions of the Notebook. It was emphasized that the Notebook represented "one man's view" (CIRCE) and therefore might serve as only a structural guide to broaden the notion of accountability and should be modified to suit local needs; that as a looseleaf notebook it should be added to, or subtracted from. It was suggested that this Notebook be used by many people within a program; that it should not become a static document; that it should be shared not only with the people within the Gifted Program but also with superintendents, local school board members, and any other group with responsibility for school programs. There was not a great deal of involvement on the part of the participants--though most of them expressed enthusiasm over the Notebook itself. At any rate, contact was made with several directors who were extremely positive in their plans for utilization, and follow-up is planned for next year.

These three modes of dissemination might prove to have a differential effect in terms of usage next year; this question will be interesting to pursue. It is thought to be important for us to determine the best means of disseminating evaluation tools for utilization by school people. This year we became much more sensitive to the need. Hopefully, next year we will become more adept with regard to that activity.

Liaison Activities

During the 1970-71 academic year CIRCE's liaison efforts with the OSPI Gifted Program staff have been primarily concerned with the dissemination of certain evaluation materials. However, these activities have also included several other important tasks, such as individual workshops, site visitations, and extended consultation in specific local areas.

Early in the fall several CIRCE staff members met with the state staff on three separate occasions to discuss activities anticipated for the coming year. At the onset it was mutually decided that the OSPI state staff would assume primary responsibility for training other project personnel with regard to utilization of evaluation products, and that CIRCE would provide the staff with the necessary support and counsel in such training procedures. The next two fall meetings were spent familiarizing the state staff with two evaluation instruments, the Classroom Report and the Class Activities Questionnaire, to facilitate their future training work. These initial meetings were significant in the sense that they shaped CIRCE's general liaison plans for the remainder of the year. Because CIRCE was to function in only a supportive role, the prime impetus for training was to come from the state.

In December, responding to the state's suggestion, CIRCE housed a two-day workshop in Urbana for state staff members and directors of the Service and Demonstration Centers to update the attending personnel in certain evaluation concerns and issues. Because CIRCE anticipated several positive outcomes from such an activity, we agreed to orchestrate the workshop. One such anticipated outcome was that hopefully the CIRCE staff would have more personal contact with gifted program personnel so that several individual working relationships might develop. It was also hoped that an increase in product utilization would occur if CIRCE played a significant role in the training procedures. During the workshop, the Classroom Report and the Class Activities Questionnaire were explained in depth, and strategies for evaluating evaluation proposals and reports were discussed. At the concluding session of that workshop, CIRCE staff members gave individual counsel to the various Service and Demonstration directors concerning their own project evaluations for rating evaluation plans. For these discussions CIRCE staff members used one-page check sheets entitled "Guidelines for Rating an Evaluation Plan." These rating sheets were later evaluated as to their helpfulness and utility (see appendix). The value of this individualized consultation aspect of the workshop is dubious. There is a great need to closely examine the real feasibility, for both evaluator and consultee, of providing any kind of meaningful consultation experience without considerable understanding of the situation, the personalities involved, or particular program needs. CIRCE evaluators noted after the experience that they had had only a cursory knowledge of the program, and felt that had they known more about the project history, its environment, and the relationships between project personnel and regional and state staffs, their efforts would have been more worthwhile. They sensed a need also for some kind of ongoing relationship with their consultees in order to provide some time in which to understand the project, its personalities, and its needs. One hour may have sufficed for the evaluators and their consultees to begin to probe general problem areas, evaluation ideas, and personal motives and commitments. But without further relationships through feedback or follow-up built

into the experience, the possibility of personal impact or real operational change was minimal. The factors of lack of follow-up and ignorance or socio-psychological dimensions seem to have greatly reduced our potential impact and forcefulness, possibly even to the extent of leaving negative impressions of a workshop consultation unevenly conducted. Some CIRCE specialists spent hours readying themselves for consultations that never materialized. Other consultants spent minutes and used their afternoon to chat of this and that. Poor business at best.

The following is a candid comment made by one of the CIRCE evaluators concerning his perceptions after participating in the individual consultation.

I am not sending you a checklist because it was not applicable to my situation. There was no evaluation "plan" in the proposal, only a bunch of gibberish that couldn't make the "weak" column of your checklist.

None of us thought this was a worthwhile tool for this workshop. In fact, the director of District One had never even been able to obtain a copy of his proposal since he took over the position in September (I am sending him a copy). Upon reading the evaluation section in "his" proposal he realized how incompetent it was also.

You are right...it was a good experience, but still symbolic of the hit-and-run-variety-show syndrome started by the state and seemingly continued by CIRCE. First a variety of speakers parades before the demonstration directors with little if any thought given as to the short or long range results. (For example, you and I can derive some benefits from listening to Stake's National Assessment speech, but for these directors it was just like a course in Latin--good to be exposed but of no use in the real world.)

I have not thought through the above comments; they are just an impression. However, it does seem to me that something is rotten in the State of CIRCE. Perhaps because I am not privy to the inner councils, I am unaware of future plans. But it seems that if any forethought had gone into this meeting, it would have occurred earlier in the school year and some provisions would have been made for follow-up by the CIRCE staff. Instead the workshop looks to me like a facade...an event staged to make people think that CIRCE has some inclination toward service or that CIRCE is earning the money it receives in its state contract with the Gifted Program.

The next major liaison endeavor occurred in March when Robert Wolf addressed several large groups of Gifted Program personnel (ranging from classroom teachers, reimbursement staff, and Service and Demonstration directors to state staff supervisors) at the Annual Association for the Gifted

Conference. Again this effort was solicited by the Springfield office, and CIRCE complied with the request. The topic of discussion for these two sessions was teacher classroom evaluation, and again the Classroom Report was distributed and explained at length. As an outgrowth of those discussions, Wolf was asked to give individual consultation with local school personnel throughout the spring months. These local efforts included site visits to discuss evaluation plans for individual projects.

The last major liaison efforts occurred when Terry Denny and Robert Wolf ran a series of four accountability workshops around the state during the month of May. The principal objective of these sessions was to discuss the applicability of the Accountability Notebook. Other related issues were covered. While these meetings were organized for the benefit of Reimbursement Directors, state supervisors, and area service center personnel were also present.

One final but more subtle general liaison activity was the continuous dialogue which occurred throughout the entire year of this project between CIRCE's project director, Robert E. Stake, and the director of the Gifted Program on a wide range of project-related issues.

Before discussing more specific liaison efforts which CIRCE staff members have been engaged in this year, a question that needs to be asked concerning broad scale activities is whether these kinds of generalized efforts are most effective in dealing with public school personnel. School men may perceive this form of liaison as extremely condescending; they resent being talked down to by university-affiliated individuals from outside the public school domain. These perceptions may be ill-founded or quite valid, but their legitimacy is inconsequential, for it is a genuine feeling that clouds the perceptual screen and adversely influences behavior.

Similarly worrisome is that large group sessions are often redundant and treat issues superficially, at best. Asking Gifted Program personnel to abandon local projects to attend such sessions may not be as rewarding as expected. We felt several times this year that workshop participants attended not because they desired to but because it was expected of them. We feel that this phenomenon can best be attacked by the state supervisory staff more than by CIRCE's efforts. CIRCE has been responsible for the content and structural aspects of the several workshops, while attendance has remained a function of the OSPI staff. However, CIRCE must begin to think of liaison activities as more than public relations or promotional efforts. Very rarely does public relations work evolve into meaningful dialogue or professional relationships. For that to occur both groups need to understand the potential benefits of a collective effort to institute change within a program. The developer must learn to appreciate the endeavors of the practitioner and vice versa.

It is entirely realistic to suggest, based on several successes this past year, that the most fruitful liaison strategy might be in site visits and individual program consultation, coupled with extensive feedback.

Some specific work in this area has been carried out this year in local areas around Illinois, and these efforts may serve to stimulate more of this activity in the future. Sites which received considerable individual

evaluation counsel from CIRCE this year were Decatur, Jacksonville, Springfield, Urbana, and two sites in Chicago. The amount of help and counsel which CIRCE gave to these and other projects ranged from very little to a great deal of supportive help. One site merely acknowledged our repeated attempts to help (Piasa); another effort consisted of a series of three meetings which resulted in a mutual agreement to abandon efforts (Springfield); other sites blossomed into productive relationships of continuous help, including as many as fifteen site visits (Urbana and Decatur). A product of this sort of relationship, established without mass meetings but through individual consultation, may be seen in the three case studies written from the project at Illinois High School (see appendix).

Efforts such as these liaison activities, especially with the faculties with which CIRCE established a strong relationship, will be continued next year. But even this seemingly more productive tactic of individual consultation and site visits becomes ineffective as a state strategy unless the full description and evaluation process of those mutual relationships are made available through the state to other project sites. The need for some kind of information monitoring system is great, and should not fail to be explored. This prototypic liaison activity should also encourage better intra-program liaison and cooperation; hopefully the various projects may take the initiative to develop these relationships.

Jacksonville

Glenn Bracht, Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology and Guidance at Southern Illinois University, presented an excellent possibility for in-service training for research assistants at CIRCE when he invited them to work with him in Jacksonville, Illinois, where he was to evaluate the school system's Independent Learning Program and their faculty training sessions. Two CIRCE assistants met with him in Jacksonville on February 19, 1971 at which time he had planned to work with the program directors on specifically formulating his evaluation procedures.

The assistants benefited from their experience in two major ways. First, active participation in the morning meeting with Bracht and the directors gave them a well-rounded picture of the practical problems of communication in the field. Second, they met with Bracht in the afternoon as he drew up some of the instruments for his evaluation that had been decided on in the morning conference. They were able to actively participate in forming workable instruments meant for a specific situation by working with Dr. Bracht on student and parent attitude questionnaires (see appendix). Close contact with a professional evaluation in a field setting working on specific problems of a site evaluation provided the research assistants with an excellent opportunity to test and round out theoretical knowledge and individual ideas.

CIRCE Resource Center

The Gifted Project Reference Library and Resource Center began during the first year of the project and was continued and expanded throughout the second year. In October the collection was moved into a permanent room with adequate physical facilities, and work was begun to further organize and cross-reference the materials.

An alphabetical card file was developed, categorizing all papers, writings, and reports by author and title if possible, otherwise by project or organization name. We began and are still developing a topical cross-reference system to facilitate wider use of the materials. At present, twenty-four subject topics, chosen for potential usefulness and logical grouping, are currently cross-referenced (see appendix).

Aside from these referenced materials (papers, unpublished writings, reports, proposals, projects, manuals) the Resource Center houses publications of CIRCE senior staff, a complete set of working papers, an education newsletter file, self-instruction series and model curriculum guides, and assorted books dealing with evaluation and measurement.

It is hoped that, with continuing organization, and with CIRCE research assistants constantly housing and carding all incoming documents, the Resource Center will continue to serve as a central location and clearing house for not only CIRCE staff research and projects but to other persons in Illinois involved in gifted program evaluation.

Curriculum Analysis Training

The problem of training teachers to do curriculum analysis was approached by bringing together individuals concerned and involved with curriculum analysis. The group convened in Boulder, Colorado, August 13-15, 1970. Utilizing the curriculum analysis materials (CMAS) developed by Irving Morrisett and William Stevens of the Social Studies Educational Consortium of Boulder, Colorado, the conferees discussed curriculum analysis. The advantages of curriculum analysis, the problems of analysis, the possibilities available to teachers in the Illinois Gifted Program, and the "how to" of doing analysis were explored in the continuing discussions. All of the sessions were video-taped for the purpose of making a training film for the teachers in Illinois. Participants at the conference were: Robert E. Stake, Irving Morrisett, William Stevens, Gordon Hoke, Jim Sanders, Chris Buethe, Charles Caruson, Bill Hobson, Margaret Wilmot, Douglas Sjogren, and Terry Hopkins Elofson.

The six hours of video-tape were cut and edited to a tape approximately one hour in length which hopefully would concisely present curriculum analysis to viewers. Mr. Richard Mann did the professional editing.

Two hundred fifty sets of materials were compiled to be used with the film. Included in the sets were three booklets from the Harvard Public Issues, S.S.E.C. Newsletters (explaining curriculum analysis) and outlines of curriculum analysis procedures. A package of instructions and worksheets was developed to coordinate the film and the sets of printed materials (see appendix). It is hoped that with these sets of packaged materials a teacher on her own or a group of teachers could view the film and try out the curriculum analysis methods.

Correspondence Course

A trial correspondence course was begun by CIRCE early this fall with the intent of developing a workable method of dealing directly with classroom teachers in problems of evaluation. Terry Hopkins Elofson compiled a starter set of basic evaluation materials which, it was hoped, would help teachers understand evaluation theory, develop basic evaluation skills, and in general become more comfortable with the concept of educational evaluation.

The first Study Kit included the CIRCE Attitude Scale and Self-Scoring Sheet, a chart of Prototypes of Evaluation, a short evaluation bibliography, and three readings: "Generalizability of Program Evaluation" and "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation" by Robert E. Stake, and "The Methodology of Evaluation" by Michael Scriven.

The Kit was sent to four women in Charleston, Illinois, an SD director, a reading consultant, an elementary school principal, and an early childhood program teacher. They read the materials and later discussed them with Terry Hopkins Elofson. In summary, the reactions to the materials were:

CIRCE Attitude Scale: frustrating to answer; changed minds frequently; provided good orientation to evaluation.

Readings: found Stake's "Generalizability" paper easiest; Scriven's was most difficult; readings should have a Ladies Home Journal approach; felt need of more confidence in evaluation; insecure about statistics and analysis.

Prototypes: interesting; liked the simplicity of chart and easily understandable category breakdown.

Other than the first Study Kit and first discussion session, little more was accomplished with the Charleston women. The original intent of the course--a self-study and self-help program with exchange of ideas to CIRCE and back in problem areas--was never realized. The general neglect of both the teachers and the CIRCE staff in general may indicate a need for better translatability from the researcher to the practitioner, and a furthering of awareness of the more specific problem areas of the classroom teacher.

Evaluation Design of a Special Program for Talented Youth

In conjunction with the Twin City Institute for Talented Youth (Minneapolis-St. Paul; Charles Caruson, Director), the following data-gathering design was developed:

1. Description of the Setting. Emphasis on the physical facilities, building and grounds, field-activity sites, perhaps with the inclusion of a map. Location of administrative offices, teacher offices, supplementary teaching resources, storage, etc.
2. Instructional Transactions. Summary of what happened, what sorts of experiences were planned and carried out, learning environment, field trips, etc.
3. Rationale. The philosophy of the special program. Basic expectation of needs of young people; ways of fostering individual growth, talents, and limitations of teachers; role of other students in student learning; etc.
4. Hopes, Expectations, Fears. Summary of the intended inputs, transactions, outcomes. A more detailed statement of item 2 with reflection of the statements of item 3.
5. The Calendar. A record of what happened when. A schedule of a typical day.
6. Class Aims, Accomplishments. A class-by-class descriptive listing of what goals are pursued and what techniques are used. Master teacher, associate teachers are identified. Comments by the evaluation team as to level of success attained.
7. Emphasis on Cognitive Talents. A description of the various classrooms as indicated by the Classroom Attitude Questionnaire. Indications of level of cognitive discourse, amount of teacher talk, etc.
8. Emphasis on Creative Talents. A descriptive of the opportunities and constraints on creative expression by individual students and student groups.
9. A Student's View of the Program. One student's essay of the short-answer final critique completed by all students.
10. The Students' Collective View of the Program. A summary of the short-answer final critique completed by all students.
11. A Participant Observer's View of the Program. The report of a student charged with the responsibility at the outset of the program of keeping a diary or notes on events and impressions.
12. The Teachers' Collective View of the Program. A summary of the final pencil-and-paper debriefing of the staff.

13. Special Reports on Unique Aspects of the Program. Such items as the admissions policy, the management, the open campus, the field trips, the in-service training component, and the influence of this program on other community programs. Done where possible by specialists brought in just for this purpose.
14. Adversary Statements. A summary of all the arguments supporting this particular program and a summary of all the arguments contesting this particular program. Left without resolution for the reader to weigh and interpret.
15. The Evaluation Plan. A statement of the purposes, constraints, personnel and other resources, and plan of operation of the evaluation team.

The Comparison of Evaluation Models

The proposal to do work in 1970-71 carried with it the intent to conduct a comparative study of the attractiveness, utility, costs, and benefits of employing at least two and possibly more evaluation models in a few Gifted Project sites. The project never progressed beyond the stages of model and site selection.

The main reason for aborting the project lay with a mismatch of CIRCE talent with proposed work requirements. The Gifted Projects who had used DESDEG in 1969-70 did not wish to continue its use; and the junior staff trained in evaluation counseling skills (Dennis Gooler, Theresa Hopkins Elofson) were utilized elsewhere on the project. However, the principal CIRCE senior staff who was to be involved, Douglas Sjogren, left the University, and other staff members were unwilling and unable to complete the project.

Achievement Testing

The proposal for second year (1970-71) included the following item indicating one of four principal areas in which CIRCE was to be involved:

3. Achievement testing. Within CIRCE a complete reorganization of the Illinois Statewide Testing Program is scheduled. It will be an objective of the Experimental Project to guide the efforts of these testing activities so that they are meaningful to the teacher--especially the gifted project teacher--who wants to monitor student progress in specific areas.

This objective was not pursued. The Evaluation Specialist (Budget Item No. I-A-3) sought by CIRCE and the Gifted Project did not choose to accept the position offered. Without this person the reorganization of the Statewide Testing Program moved only a small step forward and the objective for the Gifted Experimental Project was switched to the development of the Accountability Notebook and of a statement of cautions appropriate for achievement testing in performance contracting situations. A paper (see appendix) entitled "Measuring What Students Learn" points out the difficulties of using gain scores as indicators, using grade equivalents as units, and so on.

Some time from this study was also devoted to a study entitled "National Assessment" (see appendix). These two papers, both written by Dr. Robert E. Stake, were distributed across the state to Gifted Project directors.

Curriculum Evaluation

Edward Kelly confronted the problem of uniqueness and transfer of evaluation methods and presented his writing as a doctoral dissertation.

ABSTRACT

Curriculum Evaluation and Literary Criticism: The Explication of an Analogy

Beginning with the assumption that curriculum evaluators can profit by watching how evaluations are carried on in other fields, the paper discusses the ways curriculum evaluation is similar to literary criticism. The discussion focuses on three points. They are: (1) the role that description plays in criticism and evaluation; (2) the role that judgment and justification play in the evaluative process; and (3) the importance of language in both criticism and evaluation.

The consideration of description warns against the over-simplification of things like the classroom and its people, and suggests that there are three broad categories of descriptive data that may be used to reconstruct an object. The question of how one can know whether or not an object has been successfully described is discussed in detail, and some recommendation offered.

Troubled by the implicit occurrence of criteria that frequently underlie judgments of worth, the consideration of judgment presents a process for the development of publically reasonable expressions of judgment that should help all parties to the curricular dialogue come closer to understanding why certain judgments have been made.

Although a concern with the language of curriculum evaluation marks most of the third consideration, the principal focus is on the development of a rhetoric of the curriculum that shows how six concepts from the realm of literary criticism (metaphor, point of view, plot, action, structure, theme) can be used to critique a curriculum. Developing a consideration of the curriculum as one that has much to do with "experience," the consideration of language builds a rationale for talking about curriculum in ways that may help more people understand what is being said. The paper concludes with the warning that a move toward a criticism of curriculum should be seen as an adjunct to the present methodology of the curriculum evaluators, and not as a replacement.

Measuring Priorities

Work concerning education priorities resulted in a thesis by Dennis Cooler. Two hundred copies of the thesis were distributed to Reimbursement and Service Center personnel who requested them.

ABSTRACT

Strategies for Obtaining Clarification of Priorities in Education

Problem. One of the most pressing issues in education at the present time is accountability. Schools are coming under increasing pressure to be able to provide evidence of what they are doing, and how well they are doing it.

The present accountability emphasis appears to be on assessing the outputs, not the inputs, of education. However, accountability must consider not only the extent to which goals are achieved, but the relative importance, or priority, of those goals. Therefore, the identification or clarification of the priorities assigned to potential goals of education, by various kinds of people, represents a significant task.

This study is a report of an attempt to determine how to get good answers to the question: What do various kinds of people regard as the most important business of the school? To do so requires an understanding of the complexity of educational priorities, including how priorities are formulated, what influences those priorities, and how priorities might be measured.

Critique of Related Studies. Several studies of educational priorities have been conducted, the most extensive being Downey's Task of Public Education. That study asked a variety of people to rank, by using a Q-Sort, sixteen broad educational goals. No precedents were found for school observation as a means of determining priorities, nor were studies found that attempted to determine priorities at different levels of goal specificity. Maguire suggested that priorities might be stated in a number of different ways. That suggestion was explored in the present study.

Specific Questions Investigated. The investigation reported in this study derived from the broad question of how we can get good answers to the question of what people think the goals of the school should be. What is important? To whom? Two broad areas of concern guided the study:

1. What are some aspects of priorities that should be taken into account in a study of what people think the school ought to be? Basically, what are priorities?
2. How can we talk about priorities? What language can we use? In addition, attention focused on ways to actually assess priorities, and ways of representing or displaying what was found.

The study was an attempt to find out how to examine priorities, not on what priorities were actually held by various people. (Some initial data about actual priorities is reported in appendices.)

It is felt that people do have priorities, that those priorities seem to influence the way people behave, and that not a great deal is known about how those priorities can be measured.

Two approaches to the study of educational priorities were used in the study. The author spent a number of months observing in a school to learn something about what ought to be considered in an attempt to measure priorities. A survey was also conducted in an attempt to gain some substantive knowledge about what people think the goals of the school should be.

It was decided to "live" in a school system, to carefully observe and record what happened in a school, with the expectation that some insight concerning goals, priorities, and indicators of preference might be obtained that would verify or supplement original thinking about priorities. The ultimate intent was not to describe the classroom minute-by-minute, but rather to observe and record information about aspects and indicators of priorities, and to reflect on measurement problems that might be important.

The survey was designed to examine the results of asking people to indicate their priorities in different ways, and to explore differences in priorities held by different kinds of people.

Figure 1 shows the design of the survey. The figure indicates that people were asked to respond to three levels of goal specificity, and were asked to indicate priorities in three ways: importance, time allocation, and money allocation. In addition, people were asked about how things are (REAL) and how things ought to be (IDEAL). Instruments were designed to collect data in each cell. Rank order of different kinds of goals were determined, and mean rating profiles were developed.

Conduct of the Investigation. The intent of observing classrooms in this study did not seem to fit any of the classroom observation procedures received. Thus, it was decided to simply report what was happening in the school, to record activities, comments, and actions of teachers and students. The researcher wanted to move with as little predetermined structure as possible. He was looking for some indicators of goals, of preferences, of redundancies, but was unsure of the form those indications might take. The actual recording of classroom events was done on blank paper, divided to use half to report what happened, and half to note the researcher's reaction at the time. Teachers and students were often asked to clarify something. Each day, the notes were analyzed, and a summary made. In addition, the researcher actively intervened with questions at several points near the end of the study.

Survey instruments were developed, tested, revised, and then administered to two groups of teachers, and to a number of community members. Recommendations for changes and additions to those instruments are suggested. An extensive analysis of the data obtained was made.

The results of both aspects of the study are related to each other, together with recommendations for continued study in the area.

TO WHICH PRIORITIES ARE GIVEN

Broad Educational Aims
School Courses, Content,
and Activities
Behavioral Goals

VIEWPOINTS

Citizens
Teachers
Administrators
Parents
Students

SCALES FOR INDICATING PRIORITY

Importance
Time Allotment
Cash Allotment

REAL-IDEAL PERSPECTIVE

That which is observed
That which is desired

	Time	Importance	Money
Broad Aims			
Courses, Content Areas			
Goals			

Figure 1. Design for the Survey

10 10 10

Analysis of the Data. Goals pursued in the school can be categorized into four broad areas: content/methodology, outcomes, processes, and administration. Priorities appear to be shaped by a number of constraints of forces: personal values, knowledge of alternatives, time, money, and pressures of regulations from outside agencies. In addition, social problems appear to influence priorities. Priorities may change when different constraints on educational programs are present.

There are several ways of talking about priorities (resource allocation, time allocation, etc.). Priorities, as stated in these different languages, appear to vary.

There is little change in Real-Ideal priorities. Most people indicate that more importance should be given to most goals than is presently true, but that the relative importance of goals would change little. Respondents in this study ranked goals almost identically to the ranking of goals in Downey's 1960 study.

It was found that a group of teachers, given the same goals in simulated settings quite diverse, tended to assign the same priority to those goals regardless of the situation.

Much more extensive analysis of the survey data is included in the dissertation.

Findings. The following conclusions were made as a result of the study:

1. A study of priorities must include goals from each of the four broad areas (content/methodology, etc.).
2. The most adequate representation of priorities may be a composite of each of the ways of talking about priorities.
3. Priorities are dynamic, changing in light of social problems, new knowledge, changing value systems, new regulations, etc. These forces must be considered if priorities are to be meaningfully assessed.
4. There does not now appear to be a single indicator of priorities.
5. An understanding of priorities appears central to explanation of what a school does.

Implications of the Results. Perhaps the most important implication of the research results is that accountability is a multifaceted concept. Different people have different priorities, and these priorities appear to be subject to change. Thus, that which the school will be held accountable for may undergo constant change.

A second implication is that priorities may be manipulated. It may be possible for the school to gain support for a program by admitting new knowledge to its constituency, knowledge that may alter the perceptions of relative importance of goals.

Finally, it appears that our methodology for collecting judgmental data is still rather primitive. Such data may be extremely important for evaluation studies.

Significance. The significance of the study is its contribution to the realization that goals and priorities, intricately a part of the process of educating, are complex phenomena that cannot and should not be reduced to a simplistic perception of reality. The school's task will be misrepresented if defined only in terms of a few desired cognitive learner outcomes.

The study also contributes baseline data needed for further research into what people think is important, and how these feelings can be used as input to planning educational programs.

New insight has been gained into those factors which must be considered in our attempts to understand what people regard as the important business of the schools, and how those perceptions are developed.

Report of the Evaluation Committee:
CIRCE Experimental Gifted Project

Glenn H. Bracht
Department of Guidance & Educational Psychology
Southern Illinois University

Duane R. Neet
Director of Curriculum
Effingham Community Unit District No. 40

Joseph J. Walker
Assistant Director (Regions I and II)
Unit of Program Development for Gifted Children

July 1971

Report of the Evaluation Committee:
CIRCE Experimental Gifted Project

The evaluation team met with CIRCE staff on June 30 to review their activities with the gifted program during the past year. The report includes our reactions to each of the project's five major activities and a final section of general comments.

Product Development Follow-Up

The Classroom Report was developed during the first year of the project and then disseminated to teachers and administrators in gifted programs. This year a follow-up was begun to obtain information about who is using the Classroom Report and explanations for its use and non-use. The follow-up study will also give some indication of how teachers and administrators generally feel about evaluation and available evaluation tools. Although the results of the follow-up are not yet available, recommendations should be forthcoming about procedures for effective dissemination of evaluation techniques and instruments.

Accountability Notebook

Although the Accountability Notebook has been developed for use in the state gifted program, it will have application for teachers and administrators in all areas of education. The Notebook will stimulate people to think through what it means to be accountable. This can be done in group sessions as well as individually. Hopefully, it will also stimulate action in schools to disclose more information which displays their accounting activity.

It is difficult to predict who will use the Notebook and how it will be used. Educators are not expected to use all sections of the Notebook to the same degree. Some will place greater emphasis on fiscal accountability; others will place greater emphasis on moral accountability. A strength of the Notebook is that it can be adapted to each individual's use; its organization makes it convenient for adding pages to any section.

We expect the Accountability Notebook to broaden the user's views of accountability and become a primary resource and reference notebook for him. Since use of the Notebook will depend on its dissemination, we are pleased that CIRCE staff are studying alternative methods of distribution and orientation to the Notebook.

Liaison and In-Service Training

The liaison and in-service activities included (1) informal contacts with teachers and directors of gifted programs throughout the state, (2) in-service workshops for state personnel and directors of service and demonstration centers to orient them to the Classroom Report, the Class Activity Questionnaire, and evaluation techniques, and (3) the Accountability Notebook institutes.

Although scattered informal feedback indicates that the in-service workshops were perceived as useful, the workshop leaders could have obtained judgment data from the participants. A formal evaluation could also have been conducted for the Accountability Notebook institutes. The following outcomes appear to have resulted from the liaison and workshop activities:

1. CIRCE has obtained information about the problems that teachers and administrators have in evaluating gifted programs, the usefulness of the Classroom Report and Accountability Notebook, and the attitude toward evaluation.
2. The state staff in the gifted program are more capable of disseminating evaluation instruments to teachers and project directors and are providing more effective liaison between CIRCE and the gifted program.

In addition, the direct contact between the CIRCE staff and the teachers and administrators of gifted programs should improve the credibility of evaluation and CIRCE.

CMAS Videotape and Film

Since teachers and administrators are constantly faced with the need to select educational materials, a project was undertaken to provide training for teachers in making an analysis of curriculum materials. The film which is being produced to explain the Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS) should provide important training for teachers and administrators who select instructional materials.

The videotape should be tried with several groups of teachers whose specialties cover different subject matter areas before the presentation is put on film. Although the videotape presentation has been effective in graduate courses, we feel it should also be tested with teachers in their local school settings.

Measuring Priorities

It has become apparent in recent years that not all segments of our society value the various goals of education to the same degree. The purpose of this activity was to develop instruments which are useful for measuring the educational priorities of different groups.

We feel that the instruments developed for this project are valuable and should receive wider dissemination. Since the original report is probably too bulky for dissemination, we recommend the preparation of a manual to accompany the instruments. Although a priority study has been conducted in several Illinois communities, other communities should be encouraged to carry on their own studies rather than generalize from the communities which have already been studied.

General Comments

The major activities of the Experimental Gifted Project during the second year have substantial value for the evaluation of gifted programs. The value of the product development follow-up, liaison, and in-service training activities is already evident. The Accountability Notebook, CMAS film, and priority measures have extensive potential, but their usefulness in the gifted program has not been demonstrated yet.

During the two years of this project, CIRCE has developed several evaluation instruments for gifted programs. Since these instruments have little value unless used effectively, we are pleased with the emphasis placed on product development follow-up and in-service training during the past year. We encourage the state staff to place high priority during the following year on dissemination of the evaluation instruments which have been developed by CIRCE.

The relationship which was developed between CIRCE and the state staff during the past year should contribute to the evaluation of gifted programs. A beginning has been made in giving state staff the confidence to assume the responsibility for evaluation of gifted programs. However, additional training should be provided during the next year.

Guide for Rating an Evaluation Plan

On the second day of the December 1970 CIRCE evaluation workshop, individual conferences were planned so that Service and Demonstration Center directors might discuss with CIRCE members the evaluation sections of their SD center proposals. Thirteen CIRCE evaluation specialists teamed with the twenty SD directors who participated; for each SD proposal to be discussed, CIRCE staff members were instructed to use, as informal rating sheets, the "Guide for Rating an Evaluation Plan." (see below)

Of the twenty proposals that were individually discussed, ten CIRCE rating sheets were used. One of those was left with the SD director as a guide; the other nine were returned, many with comments concerning the usefulness of the checklists. Most of the CIRCE evaluators' comments implied that the checklists themselves were inappropriate; others leaned toward the proposal itself as reason for the inapplicability of the checklists. For whatever reason, fully half the evaluator-director teams found that the checklists were not usable as guides for rating the evaluation sections of the SD proposals. Some CIRCE comments:

Checklist did not apply as there were no evaluation plans.
All ratings were either "weak" or unknown. (Steele)

Suggestion that these criteria are too "stringent" for application to an evaluation "subsection" of a proposal for refunding. (Kelly)

I gave the checklist to the client, indicating what a proposal should encompass. Since their evaluation is almost a research project, it isn't fair to use the checklist on their plan. (Bunda)

The checklist...was not very useful. The evaluation sections of the project proposals did not in any way match with the questions being posed by the project directors, or the intentions of those project directors. I began to use the checklist with the first group, and it did not seem to make any sense to them...they indicated that "well, you know, it was a proposal and we had to write something." Both project directors said that they did not know really what was in the proposal. It had been written a long time ago or it had been written by someone else. (Gooler)

Other CIRCE members simply commented that the checklists were "not relevant" or "inappropriate."

The rating sheets, however, were in the hands of CIRCE staff, and seem to have been at least looked at during the individual conferences. They did reportedly have some positive uses even though they might not have served as valid or appropriate instruments for rating the SD proposals. They were helpful as both stimulators of discussion and as informal guides of sorts for participating SD directors, and served as vehicles through which SD directors were forced to at least look at the otherwise unfamiliar evaluation sections of their proposals. And that CIRCE was able to categorize and itemize its criteria for rating evaluation plans served as tangible evidence that CIRCE members did have some definite guideposts for commenting on the SD proposals.

Our rating sheets, however useful in determining strengths and weaknesses of more detailed and comprehensive evaluation plans, seem to have been far too discriminating for use in rating the often sketchy evaluation sections of SD proposals.

We received a great deal of information that would seem to indicate that the proposals we were evaluating were simply inadequate. Many of them were too short or general to rate; others received a great many "weak" ratings. From the professional evaluators' standpoints, they seem to have been, indeed, disappointing. This may indicate the inadequacy of the proposals; it may also indicate the great difference in the emphasis placed on the evaluation sections of those proposals. What was the object of our major thrust of efforts and talents was apparently, to SD directors, only a few paragraphs of writing, relatively unimportant within the refunding proposals. Conditions for refunding stipulate inclusion of an evaluation subsection: that the proposals contained evaluation sections was no guarantee of an interest in or a commitment to good, honest evaluation. We based an afternoon of individual discussion on the assumption that evaluation was important to them and to the effectiveness of their proposals. This appears to have been a questionable assumption.

What was the intended use of the CIRCE checklists? If our intention was to give SD directors more awareness of and interest in their evaluation plans, we did, at least for the duration of the participating SD directors' individual conferences. We have no evidence of carryover or transfer. If our intention was to teach SD directors how to write an evaluation section for a proposal, the checklists to some extent did that, in that they provided an outline for the contents and major points of an evaluation. If our intention was to point out strengths and weaknesses of the proposal for the purpose of eventual alteration of the evaluation sections, we needed to have built into either the meetings or the instrument some means of successful follow-up. If our intention was to effectively evaluate the checklists we used in rating the proposals, we would have received better feedback concerning the checklists had both CIRCE evaluators and SD directors been informed of this intention.

The rating sheet seems to have been a useful tool to stimulate discussion and as information topic guide to promote exchange of ideas within an individual discussion. Their use for evaluating the proposal or for altering and improving the project is not recommended.

Checklist Results

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Weak</u>
Communication:	20%	50%	30%
Purpose:	18%	36%	46%
Technique:	13%	37%	50%
Practicality:	13%	58%	29%

CIRCE Evaluators

Kelly
Kerins
Denny
House
Stake
Steele
Bunda
Coller
Walstrom
Hopkins
Wolf
Cooler

Project Directors (SD)

Stark, Moore
Mishken
Hutchins, Buckholz
Rockel, Postl
Powe, Todd
Horsbruck, Peters
Bodine, Brinkhoff
Habeeker
Gotch, Laughlin
Jeter, Farrell
Fry
Varby

GUIDE FOR RATING AN EVALUATION PLAN

COMMUNICATION

Clarity: Does the plan read well? explicit? free of jargon?

Integrity: Do its pieces fit together? sense of unity?

Seductivity: Does it persuade the reader to take part? intriguing?

PURPOSE

Rationale: Does it answer "why evaluate?" are goals explicit?

Plan: Are activities outlined? are plan and rationale consistent?

Complementarity: Is it compatible with the program? with other studies?

TECHNIQUE

Variable selection:	Are selections relevant, imaginative, flexible?
Data gathering:	Are efforts design-oriented, valid, redundant?
Reporting out:	Are clients, audiences specified? responsibility?

PRACTICALITY

Scope: Is the plan feasible? are staff, facilities available?

Cost: Are estimates reasonable? are benefits worth cost?

Balance: Are resources nicely allocated? spread too thin?

COMMENTS:

Curriculum Materials Analysis System

In-service Training

MATERIALS TO BE USED WITH THE FILM OR VIDEOTAPE PROGRAM

CMAS

Produced by Robert E. Stake
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
Gifted Experimental Project E-116
University of Illinois

Spring, 1971

Terry Hopkins, General Editor

State of Illinois

Michael Bakalis
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Draft Prototype to Accompany Videotape

Please read this page before viewing the program.

These materials are to be used with the film Curriculum Materials Analysis System. Don't use them unless you have the film. The materials and film can be studied by one person or by a group of people.

The film has a discussion of the procedures and uses of the CMAS; the SSEC Newsletter also describes the CMAS; the Harvard Public Issues booklets are to be analyzed as a practice exercise. The directions for using the Newsletter and Harvard Public Issues booklets with the film are given in the film and in this packet of materials.

Time required: Set aside two hours for working through the program and materials. When the projector is ready to go, here's what you should do:

1. Watch and listen to the program while CMAS is introduced and described. It won't be necessary to take notes or use these materials while the program is underway.
2. After about 10 minutes, you will be asked to interrupt the program, turn off the projector, and return again to this set of materials.

Now turn on the projector.

STOP

ONE

(15 minutes)

You have heard and seen a description of the main headings of the Curriculum Materials Analysis System. Now you should turn to the Newsletter from the SSEC (Social Science Education Consortium). Please spend about ten minutes reading pages 1-4 of the Newsletter.

Then take five more minutes to think about the questions below. Make brief notes of your own tentative answers to the questions.

1. Who benefits from curriculum analysis?
2. Do you need a system like this? Why? Why not?
3. Curriculum materials are not the whole of a curriculum. Is this system useful only with the materials? If not, how else is it useful?

Have fifteen minutes passed? Turn on the projector.

STOP

TWO

(20 minutes)

How might you answer the question:

Whose opinions, whose judgments should be considered?

Spend less than five minutes on this part. List the names of as many people you can think of whom you would trust to make judgments about curriculum materials for your class. Start the list with your own name.

Do you feel that these people would agree pretty much on what the curriculum should be?

Turn to next page.



whose opinions, whose judgments should be considered?

Spend less than five minutes on this part. List the names of as many

as you can think of whom you would want to hear judgments from.

Remember, let our class hear the list with your own name

Do not feel that you must write down every name you can think of.

Thank you for your contribution.

Thank you for your contribution.

Now try your hand at analyzing some actual curriculum materials. You will need to find one booklet among these materials:

Got it? Turn to next page.

Read page three of Cases and Controversy. As you read, think about the CMAS topic "2.0 Rationale and Objectives." Jot down your answers to the following:

1. The focus of the Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project is:
2. What are some anticipated outcomes for students who use these materials?

These answers of yours would be entered in Section 2.0 if you were doing a CMAS analysis of Harvard Project Physics.

Twenty minutes up? Finish watching the program before turning to the next page.

After viewing the film.

Two units from the Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project are included with your materials. After scanning Taking a Stand and The American Revolution, write a brief statement for each about the CMAS topic "2.0 Rationale and Objectives." Do these booklets exemplify the rationale and objectives of the Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project?

Rationale and Objectives	<u>Taking a Stand</u>	<u>The American Revolution</u>

We want to know if you found the experience a useful one: Please
write your comments below, tear off at the dotted line and send to

CIRCE - CMAS
270 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Jacksonville Questionnaires

MY HIGH SCHOOL

Instructions: Given below are fifteen statements about the educational program at your high school. We all feel differently about such matters and this scale is an attempt to let you express your opinions. We are interested in how you feel the educational program at your high school has affected you. Respond to each item as follows:

Agree Very Strongly:	+3	Disagree Very Strongly:	-3
Agree Strongly:	+2	Disagree Strongly:	-2
Agree:	+1	Disagree:	-1

For example, if you agree strongly with a statement, you would write a +2 on the line preceding the statement. If you disagree very strongly with a statement, you would write a -3 on the line preceding the statement. Respond to each statement as best you can. Go rapidly but carefully. Do not skip any items.

- _____ 1. I am satisfied with the education I am receiving.
- _____ 2. I have worked hard to get a good high school education.
- _____ 3. I prefer assignments in which the teacher tells me exactly what to do.
- _____ 4. I get satisfaction from the things I do in school.
- _____ 5. I study certain topics in greater depth than is required by my teachers.
- _____ 6. I have not been given enough responsibility in my high school education.
- _____ 7. I generally study for grades rather than for the sake of learning.
- _____ 8. The teachers are generally concerned about giving me a good education.
- _____ 9. When I have free time during the school day, I usually do other things instead of studying.
- _____ 10. I usually do most of my studying during the few days before an exam rather than throughout a unit of study.
- _____ 11. The past school year was valuable in preparing me for the future.
- _____ 12. The teachers have given me responsibilities which most high school students don't have.
- _____ 13. The teachers put a lot of pressure on me.

_____ 14. The past school year was generally a waste of time for me.

_____ 15. I study on my own topics which are not required by my teachers.

I am a _____ freshman _____ sophomore _____ junior _____ senior.

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Given below are twelve statements about the individualized learning program at your son/daughter's high school. We all feel differently about such matters and this scale is an attempt to let you express your opinions. We are interested in how you feel the individualized learning program has affected your son/daughter who is participating in the program. Respond to each item as follows:

Agree Very Strongly:	+3	Disagree Very Strongly:	-3
Agree Strongly:	+2	Disagree Strongly:	-2
Agree:	+1	Disagree:	-1

For example, if you agree strongly with a statement, you would write a +2 on the line preceding the statement. If you disagree very strongly with a statement, you would write a -3 on the line preceding the statement. Respond to each statement as best you can. Please do not discuss any of the statements with you son/daughter before you complete the questionnaire. We would like to know your opinion. Do not skip any items.

- _____ 1. I am satisfied with the education my son/daughter is receiving.
- _____ 2. My son/daughter has worked hard to get a good high school education.
- _____ 3. My son/daughter gets satisfaction from the things he does in school.
- _____ 4. My son/daughter studies certain topics in greater depth than is required by his teachers.
- _____ 5. My son/daughter has not been given enough responsibility in his high school education.
- _____ 6. My son/daughter has been required to do too much studying.
- _____ 7. The individualized learning program has prepared my son/daughter well for his future.
- _____ 8. The teachers have given my son/daughter responsibilities which most high school students don't have.
- _____ 9. My son/daughter is proud to be in the individualized learning program.
- _____ 10. My son/daughter would learn more in a traditional high school program.
- _____ 11. My son/daughter has matured in assuming responsibility through his participation in the individualized learning program.
- _____ 12. I am generally familiar with the individualized learning program.

CIRCE Resource Center Topical File

Topics which are currently cross-referenced by card file in the CIRCE Resource Center include:

- Biological Science Curriculum Study
- Bureau of Educational Research
- Center for the Study of Evaluation
- Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory
- Curriculum Projects
- Disadvantaged
- EPIE
- Evaluation Reports and Plans
- Gifted Projects
- Individual School Programs
- Individual School Projects
- Learning Research and Development Center
- Math Programs
- National Assessment
- Newsletter File
- OSPI
- Professional Organizations
- Programmed Instruction
- Rocky Mountain Educational Laboratory
- SCIS
- Self-Instruction Programs
- Special Education
- Tests and Testing Manuals
- Titles I, II, III, and IV

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 123408517